

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24

FILED BY CLERK

MAR -9 2010

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,)	2 CA-CR 2009-0222
)	DEPARTMENT A
Appellee,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.)	Not for Publication
)	Rule 111, Rules of
JOSE ARMANDO PARRA,)	the Supreme Court
)	
Appellant.)	
_____)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR-20082982

Honorable Richard S. Fields, Judge

AFFIRMED

Robert J. Hirsh, Pima County Public Defender
By Kristine Maish

Tucson
Attorneys for Appellant

H O W A R D, Chief Judge.

¶1 Appellant Jose Armando Parra was charged with theft of a means of transportation, third-degree burglary, and possession of burglary tools. Following a three-day jury trial, he was convicted of unlawful use of a means of transportation, a class five felony and a lesser included offense of the charge of theft of a means of

transportation in count one of the indictment. *See* A.R.S. § 13-1803(A)(1). The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence, placed Parra on two years' probation, and ordered him to serve four days in jail, which the court suspended pending successful completion of probation. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), stating she has thoroughly reviewed the record and has found no meritorious issues to raise on appeal. She asks this court to search the record for "error." Parra has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Viewed in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, the evidence was sufficient to support the jury's finding of guilt. *See State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999). And, the term of probation is authorized by law.

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. Therefore, we affirm Parra's conviction and the probationary term imposed.

/s/ Joseph W. Howard

JOSEPH W. HOWARD, Chief Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ Philip G. Espinosa

PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Presiding Judge

/s/ Virginia C. Kelly

VIRGINIA C. KELLY, Judge